

Postal Regulatory Commission
Office of the Chief Admin. Officer

DEC 2 2011

RECEIVED
BEFORE THE
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268
2011 DEC 2 11 48

In the Matter of:

Orchard, Iowa 50460
Post Office State ZIP Code

Docket No: A 2012-45

Philip K. Lack, Petitioner(s)

PARTICIPANT STATEMENT

1. Petitioner(s) are appealing the Postal Service's Final Determination concerning the Orchard post office. The Final Determination was posted October 3, 2011 (date)

2. In accordance with applicable law, 39 U.S.C. § 404(d)(5), the Petitioner(s) request the Postal Regulatory Commission to review the Postal Service's determination on the basis of the record before the Postal Service in the making of the determination.

3. Petitioners: Please set out below the reasons why you believe the Postal Service's Final Determination should be reversed and returned to the Postal Service for further consideration. (See pages of the Instructions for an outline of the kinds of reasons the law requires us to consider.) Please be as specific as possible. Please continue on additional paper if you need more space and attach the additional page(s) to this form.

Please refer to the
attached sheets

We, the patrons of the Orchard Post Office, Orchard, Iowa, believe the Postal Service's Final Determination should be reversed and returned to the Postal Service for further consideration, for the following reasons; in addition to those we have heretofore sent you via mail, dated October 21, 2011:

1. In rural communities, with small post offices like Orchard's, the patrons do not have the luxury of going to retailers in the community (no stores) for stamps and with packages for mailing (horse and buggy Mennonites are concerned about the disadvantages of closure of the post office, especially). Besides, rural mail carriers can only take packages up to 13 oz. We must not inadvertently invite other mailing companies to encroach on the post office's business. Patrons

mailing large Christmas packages out via a rural mail carrier would have to seek other means of mailing their packages.

2. Another reason for retaining the small post office, namely, the aforementioned one, is that they can help reduce the post office debt by sharing the work load of big districts through computer use. The U. S. Postal Service has 67 districts and 50 states. Why not start the cuts at the top of the postal service, consolidate some of those districts, eliminate million administrator salary positions (overlapping ones, at least). Administrators do not sort mail or sell stamps.

3. Safety is a factor in maintaining a post office. Patrons receive medicines and other items, via the mail, that require a certain level of temperature that a post office building

affords.

4. Because the Orchard Post Office is operating far below the annual USPS stated figure of \$27, 694, The Orchard Post Office should remain in operation. The USPS owns the post office bldg. and pays only \$600.⁰⁰ per year for the lot(s) on which the bldg. sits. The officer in charge (OIC) is paid an hourly wage, plus \$.51 a mile. She does not receive health insurance, or pension, or paid vacation or sick days. She is paid for days on the job only. Small post offices could function well with an O.I.C. in charge. (See October 21, 2011 attached sheet - mailing to you - The Postal Regulatory Commission). An OIC in charge would be a savings and a means to employ further people. Besides, closing the Orchard Post Office and replacing it with rural carriers will doubtless cost more than

4

maintaining the post office because the carriers have pensions, paid holidays, vacation pay, and insurance benefits.

To reiterate, the USPS has a bargain by maintaining the Orchard Post Office, Orchard, Iowa, 50460. No economic advantage is to be gained by closing the post office in Orchard, Iowa.

Most sincerely yours,

Philip K. Lack

Postscript: On a personal note — I have always paid my bills via the post office with use of stamps — never by electronic means. And I hope to continue to do so locally. The lack of courtesy envelopes, for bills I receive back, that suggest I save a stamp and pay electronically, receive thereon a written rebuke from me! ^{PKL}

Philip K. Lack
P.O. Box 145
Orchard, Iowa 50460

October 21, 2011

Postal Regulatory Commission
 901 New York Avenue NW, Suite 200
 Washington, DC 20268-0001

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing to appeal the "Final Determination to Close the Orchard Post Office" which serves me and this small farming community.

I, especially, took notice of **Part IV – Economic Savings** - I do believe it is a grievous error made by the USPS when it says, "The Postal Service estimates an annual savings of \$27,894 with a breakdown as follows:

- Postmaster Salary (EAS – 55, NO COLA) [Which I do not understand.]	
- Fringe	\$7,714
	+600
- Total Amount Costs	\$31,340
- Less Annual Cost of	
Replacement Service	- 3,446
- Total Annual Saving	\$27,894"

First of all there is no postmaster at the Orchard Post Office, only an Officer in Charge who is paid an hourly wage plus \$.51 a mile. She does not receive any health insurance, pension, paid vacation, or sick days. She is paid only for the days she is there -- She has been there since August, 2010.

Second, the figure of \$3,346 for "Less Annual Cost of Replacement Service" is probably an error because the replacement service the USPS has in mind would be for carrier service. The carrier now is already paid considerably more than an Officer in Charge. He/she would certainly have even more work hours with the closing of the Orchard Post Office.

The USPO is getting a bargain by maintaining the Orchard Post Office. There is no economic advantage in closing this small post office in Orchard, Iowa.

Sincerely yours,

Philip K. Lack,